

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 20, 2004, claim 13 has been amended.

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15 and 16 are independent claims. The Office Action indicates that claims 1-12, 15 and 16 are allowed.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Specification Objection

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to for several informalities. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, paragraph Nos. 39 and 40 of the specification have been amended to be consistent with claims 1 and 6, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,754,150 issued to Matsui (“Matsui”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,109,219 issued to Kastan, *et al.* (“Kastan”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, claim 13 has been amended to recite “the variable resistor *automatically* varies a voltage applied to the liquid crystals *in response to variation of a view angle ...*”. In this regard, the specification describes:

“The angle detection method used in the PC system 10 according to the present invention may be *either a manual or an automatic method*. For example, the manual angle detection method that involves *the user determining the viewing angle* includes a method causing the user to enter a desired viewing angle on a keyboard, and a method causing the user to select the viewing angle with a defined structure mounted on the PC or monitor, preferably with a variable resistor.

While on the other hand, *the automatic angle detection method* includes a method using the above-mentioned structure mounted on a hinge supporting the LCD module 20 on the PC system 10 to generate information about the rotational angle of the LCD panel based on that of the hinge to the LCD module 20.”

(Paragraph Nos. 32 and 33)

Thus, claim 13 is directed to the automatic angle detection method and hence different from the manual angle detection method, in which an user manually adjusts an view angle. As previously mentioned, Matusi describes “Therefore, by … *manually adjusting the luminance adjusting dial*, an infliction point on a gamma correction curve is synchronized …” (column 10, lines 21-26), which means that Matsui is directed to the manual angle detection method. Thus, Matsui fail to disclose or suggest “the variable resistor *automatically* varies a voltage applied to the liquid crystals *in response to variation of a view angle …*”, as claimed.

The secondary reference to Kastan also fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Since none of the cited references this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 13 is patentable over them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 13.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of Kastan and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,628,255 issued to Ferrel, et al. (“Ferrel”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 stems from claim 13. As previously mentioned, claim 13 is believed to be patentable over Matsui and Kastan because, for example, none of them discloses or suggests “the variable resistor *automatically* varies a voltage applied to the liquid crystals *in response to variation of a view angle ...*”.

As previously argued, Ferrel fails to cure the deficiency from Matsui and Kastan. Thus, the subject matter of claim 13 would not have been obvious from the asserted combination of Matsui, Kastan and Ferrel. Claim 14 is dependent from claim 13 and would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 18, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\COM\485639.1